



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,648	05/29/2007	Zhiyong Luo	PB60642	8806
20462	7590	09/17/2009	EXAMINER	
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION			MOORE, SUSANNA	
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY-US, UW2220				
P. O. BOX 1539			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
KING OF PRUSSIA, PA 19406-0939			1624	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/17/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

US_cipkop@gsk.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/596,648	LUO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SUSANNA MOORE	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-30 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group (I), claim(s) 1-23, drawn to the compounds in claim 1, pyrazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidines and compositions thereof.

Group (II), claim(s) 24-30, drawn to a method of using the compounds of Group (I).

The claims herein lack unity of invention under PCT rule 13.1 and 13.2 since, under 37 CFR 1.475(a) Group I -Group II lack unity of invention since under 37 CFR 1.475:

Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features...those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

The technical feature corresponding to Group (I), formula (I), is the substituted pyrazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine compounds. The special technical feature of Group (I), the pyrazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine core, can be found in US 20030069246, see page 33. The special technical feature of Group II is a method of making or using the compounds of Group (I). Therefore the above claims are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept and there is a lack of unity of invention because they lack a common technical feature. Accordingly,

unity of invention is considered to be lacking and restriction of the invention in accordance with the rules of unity of invention is considered to be proper.

Furthermore, since the groups do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 and lack the same or corresponding special technical features, the claims lack unity of invention and should be limited to the groups restricted above. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Further, even if unity of invention under 37 C.F.R. § 1.475(a) were not lacking, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.475(b) a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations:

- (1) a product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
- (2) a product and a process of use of said product; or
- (3) a product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product;
- (4) a process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or
- (5) a product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.

And, according to 37 C.F.R. § 1.475(c): If an application contains claims to more or less than one of the combinations of categories of invention set forth in paragraph (b), unity of invention might not be present.

Therefore, because the claims are drawn to products and multiple methods of use of compounds of formula (I), according to 37 C.F.R. § 1.475(e), the determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim. The claims in the instant application lack unity of invention and should be limited to one product, one method of use, or one process of preparing the product.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Rejoinder Advisory

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102,

103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder**. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the Examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

A telephone call was made to Laura Madden on September 11, 2009, to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made. Applicant was advised a Restriction requirement was being sent by mail.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susanna Moore whose telephone number is (571) 272-9046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susanna Moore/
Examiner, Art Unit 1624